

**REMARKS**

**A. Claims 1-5, 8, 11-14 and 17**

Claims 1-5, 8, 11-14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on a combination of Terry et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,996,082 (“Terry”) and Odenwalder et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,804,220 (“Odenwalder”). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Neither Terry nor Odenwalder taken separately, or in combination, discloses or suggests the transmission of “at least one [data] transmission, among a number of transmissions, that comprises a number of contiguous sub-slots associated with at least two time slots, where the number of subslots may vary from timeslot to timeslot within each transmission” and the transmission of a separate control channel for each [data] transmission, where the duration of the separate control channel is dependent upon the number of transmitted sub-slots, as in claims 1-5, 8, 11-14 and 17.

In the Office Action the Examiner appears to rely on Terry for a disclosure of the claimed data transmissions. However, upon reading Terry and the excerpts relied on by the Examiner (Fig. 8, transmissions UE A, UE B and UE C) Applicants note that Terry does not disclose or show a transmission where the number of subslots may vary from timeslot to timeslot within the transmission. Instead, it appears that within a given transmission the same number of subslots are used from timeslot to timeslot. For example, within transmission UE A, each timeslot S5 through S7 contains the same number of subslots (i.e., 3).

Because neither Terry nor Odenwalder discloses or suggest the claimed data transmissions in conjunction with the claimed control channel transmissions it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn and claims 1-5, 8, 11-14 and 17 be allowed.

**B. Claim 6**

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) based on the combination of Terry, Odenwalder and Toskala et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,535,503 (“Toskala”). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants note that claim 6 depends on claim 1 and is therefore patentable over the combination of Terry, Odenwalder and Toskala for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1 because Toskala does not overcome the deficiencies of Terry and Odenwalder.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 6.

**C. Claims 18 and 19**

Claims 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the combination of Terry, Odenwalder and Malkamaki et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,577,024 (“Malkamaki”). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse these rejections for at the following reasons.

Applicants note that claims 18-19 depend on claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable over the combination Terry, Odenwalder and Malkamaki for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1 because Malkamaki does not overcome the deficiencies of Terry and Odenwalder.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 18 and 19.

In the event this response does not place the present application in condition for allowance, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (703) 266-3330 to schedule a personal interview.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3777 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

CAPITOL PATENT & TRADEMARK LAW FIRM, PLLC.

By: //John E. Curtin//  
John E. Curtin, Reg. No. 37,602  
P.O. Box 1995  
Vienna, Virginia 22183  
(703) 266-3330